Fax:23698454 Apr 14 '05

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 10217-US-PA

Application No.: 10/707,608

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action objected the specification and rejected all presently-pending claims 1-11

Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated

by Troutman. (U.S. 6,157,356). Applicants have amended the specification to overcome the

objection and amended claims 1, 2 to overcome the rejection. Applicants also added claims 12

17. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-17 remain pending in the present

application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections and Rejections

In the specification, "Ito" is amended as -I to- in paragraph [0026], "P9408" is amended.

as -P(408)- in paragraph [0029] and "conclusions" is amended as --conclusion-- in paragraph

[0031] to overcome the objection.

The newly added claims 12-17 are described in paragraphs [0025], [0027] and shown in

Fig 4, and no new matter is entered. Especially, the first and second external power lines of

claim 12 are the two external power lines 402, 404 of Fig. 4. However, the number of external

power lines is not limited in the present invention. Three or more external power lines may also

be applied to the organic light emitting display of the present invention.

Page 8

Apr 14 '05 16:06 P. 10/12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 10217-US-PA

Application No.: 10/707,608

Applicants respectfully traverse the 102(b) rejection of claims I-11 because Troutman

(U.S.6,157,356) does not teach every element recited in these claims.

Fax:23698454

In order to properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C 102, each and

every element of claim in issue must be found, "either expressly or inherently described, in a

single prior art reference". "The identical invention must be shown in as complete details as is

contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPO2d

1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." See M.P.E.P. 2131, 8th ed., 2001.

The present invention is in general related an as claim 1 recites:

Claim 1. An organic light-emitting display having a plurality of pixels and a plurality of

external power lines, the organic light-emitting display being characterized in that:

each of the external power line diverts into a plurality of internal power lines, and each internal lines is electrically to connected to a portion of the pixels, wherein the internal power

lines connected to different external powers line are not connected together.

Troutman fails to teach that the organic light-emitting display comprises a plurality of

external power lines, each external power line diverts into a plurality of internal power lines, and

the internal power lines connected to different external powers line are not connected together.

In Troutman's reference, an OLED display is disclosed as shown in Fig.1A and 1B. Troutman-

only teaches the bias voltage Vb is applied to all diodes in the display (col. 2, lines 29).

Troutman does not teach or suggest how the bias voltage Vb is applied to each diode. Troutman

does not teach or suggest that the power source applied to each diode is by using a plurality of

external power lines and a plurality of internal power lines, wherein each of the external power

line diverts into a plurality of internal power lines, and each internal lines is electrically to

Page 9

PAGE 10/12 * RCVD AT 4/14/2005 4:01:41 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:23698454 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-06

Apr 14 '05 16:06 P.11/12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 10217-US-PA Application No.: 10/707,608

connected to a portion of the pixels, and the internal power lines connected to different external powers line are not connected together.

Fax:23698454

Therefore, Troutman does not teach every element recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-11 patently define over the prior art as well.

Fax: 23698454 Apr 14 '05 16:06 P. 12/12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 10217-US-PA Application No.: 10/707,608

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-17 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2005

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office 7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800 Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: <u>belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw</u>
<u>Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw</u>